thus be hard at work right now on a plan for Trump to sell off his assets.

''The deals that she and her husband were pocketing—hundreds of thousands of foreign money,'' Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) told the Breitbart website, the right-wing outlet once led by the soon-to-be White House chief strategist, Stephen K. Bannon. Issa added that Clinton wanted her activities ''to be behind closed doors'' and ''did that because she doesn't know where the line is.''

We can assume that Issa will press the president-elect about the dangers of doing business deals ''behind closed doors'' and instruct him about where the ethical ''line'' should be.

And it would be truly heartening to know that Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah), a vociferous critic of the Clinton Foundation (''There's a connection between what the foundation is doing and what the secretary of state's office is doing''), plans to apply the same benchmarks to Trump.

After all, when the chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee was asked last August on CNN if Trump should release his tax returns, his answer was both colorful and unequivocal. ''If you're going to run and try to become the president of the United States,'' Chaffetz replied, ''you're going to have to open up your kimono and show everything, your tax returns, your medical records. You are . . . just going to have to do that.''

I eagerly await Chaffetz's news conference reiterating his kimono policy, since he made very clear that he sees his role as nonpartisan. ''My job is not to be a cheerleader for the president,'' he said. ''My job is to hold them accountable and to provide that oversight. That's what we do.'' Early, comprehensive hearings on the problems Trump's business dealings would pose to his independence and trustworthiness as our commander in chief would be a fine way to prove Chaffetz meant this.

Republicans did an extraordinary job raising doubts about Clinton—helped, we learned courtesy of The Post, by a Russian disinformation campaign. Does the GOP want to cast itself as a band of hypocrites who cared not at all about ethics and were simply trying to win an election?

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. I do not see anybody else seeking recognition, but let me just say just a little bit more on these issues. Yesterday I commended my Republican colleague, Senator MCCAIN. He complained about the decision of his own party to do away with regular order in our appropriations process. He's absolutely right. We should have debated and passed those bills the way we used to do. Ten months ago that's what the Republican leadership said they wanted to do, and they are in control here. And we worked hard in the Appropriations Committee, Republicans and Democrats together, and we reported out all our appropriations bills. Hundreds and hundreds of hours of work by members, even more by their staffs.

Almost every one of these bills was bipartisan, and they passed usually by a unanimous vote or close to it. All that goes for naught. I commented about just one of these, and of course that is the State and foreign operations bill. Both before Benghazi and since Benghazi, the Republican chairman of the subcommittee and I have put in money, a considerable amount of money, for the security of our embassies and our personnel abroad. Rather than acknowledge their own responsibility for having cut funding for security prior to Benghazi, the House Republicans wasted tens of millions of dollars on hearings to blame the administration. Madam President, maybe double standards make for a sound bite on the evening news, especially if it sounds good and the people putting it on haven't done the research to find out what's really going on.

But it's no consolation to the men and women serving at our embassies and throughout the world to represent the American people. Oftentimes in danger, as we just saw within the last couple of days in the Philippines. It does them no good to see Congress spend tens of millions of dollars to decry the lack of security, tens of millions of taxpayers' dollars on hearings that proved nothing, to get on television for political purposes, and then scrapping the appropriations bills and supporting instead a continuing resolution that will cut funds for embassy security by half a billion dollars.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5963

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, soon I will offer a unanimous consent request with regard to a bill that would reform and reauthorize Federal juvenile justice programs. This bill is known as the Supporting Youth Opportunity and Preventing Delinquency Act of 2016. It passed the other Chamber last month by a vote of 382–29.

The bipartisan House bill is modeled closely to one that I introduced over a year ago with the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE. That legislation was titled the ''Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Reauthorization Act.'' It has 19 Senate cosponsors and cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, without a single dissenting vote last year. The House companion before us today also won the unanimous approval of a committee in the other Chamber before passing the House with overwhelming support a few weeks ago.

The two bills are remarkably similar in most respects, indicating their objectives. One such objective is to extend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act for 5 more years. That Federal statute was last reauthorized in 2002, and it is long overdue for an update. Congress is still funding juvenile justice programs that expired in 2007, nearly a decade ago.

I think my colleagues know of the hard work of Senator ENZI, chairman of the Budget Committee, and a program that he has of the hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer money we are spending that has not been authorized by the authorizing committees. So getting a lot of bills that have expired reauthorized is in the spirit of what Senator ENZI is trying to promote among the 15, 16, or however many committees we have in the Senate that don't do their work on a regular basis.

The centerpiece of the 1974 act is its core protections for youth. Over 40 years ago, Congress committed to making Federal grants available to States that observed these core protections, of which there are now four.

The first core protection discourages the detention of children and youth for extremely minor infractions, such as truancy, underage tobacco use, disobeying parents, and running away. No State would ever jail an adult; that is an important emphasis. No State would ever jail an adult for this same conduct. And research shows that nothing much positive comes out of locking up children for conduct that isn't even criminal.

The second core protection calls for juveniles to be kept out of adult facilities except in certain very rare instances. The third calls for juveniles to be separated from adults when they are held in adult facilities. And the fourth calls for States to try to reduce disproportionate minority contact in their juvenile justice system.

That is from 1974, and those goals are still legitimate goals. Under our proposed legislation, as under this current law, if a State commits to meeting these core protections for youth, it can expect to continue receiving Federal grant money to support its juvenile justice activities.

Our second objective for this legislation is to make reforms to current law so that taxpayer-supported juvenile justice programs will yield best possible outcomes. To that end, our bill reflects the latest research that works best with at-risk children and youth.

We added provisions to promote the rehabilitation of runaways who are at high risk of being trafficked. We included language to discourage shackling of pregnant juveniles during childbirth. After learning that a handful of States receiving Federal grant funds are locking up children as young as 8 or 9 for minor infractions, such as truancy, we called for a phaseout of valid court orders permitting that practice. Last but not least, we responded to concerns voiced by whistleblowers by adding accountability measures to protect the taxpayers and promote more oversight of justice reforms.

These accountability measures are something I have been working on both as ranking member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of that committee for a long period of time, not

just on the juvenile justice program but on a lot of other programs where taxpayer money is being wasted by having different standards in some programs versus the others, particularly when the bureaucracy at the Justice Department is not policing what States do and they let the States get out. We have all kinds of GAO reports or reports from inspectors general that come back to us saying that this money to the States is not following the intent that was intended by Congress. I think all Senators assume a responsibility to make sure that taxpayer money will go as far as it can. So we worked some of those accountability issues into every bill I can get out of the Justice Department that affects these programs.

Groups such as the Campaign for Youth Justice, the Coalition for Juvenile Justice, Boys Town, Fight Crime: Invest in Kids, among many others, endorsed the legislation and contributed input. We also consulted the National Criminal Justice Association, the National District Attorneys Association, and a coalition of roughly two dozen anti-human trafficking groups that endorsed the legislation as well.

The House bill before us today includes many or most of the same provisions that Senator WHITEHOUSE and I championed, and it enjoys the support of virtually all of the same 100-plus organizations that endorsed the versions we sponsored in this Chamber. The House made a few key changes to preserve more flexibility for States.

Speaking of those 100-plus organizations, I feel a responsibility to them to work as hard as I can to get this legislation passed because they have worked so hard at the grass roots level.

Let me go back to the flexibility we give to the States that the House put in. States that object to phasing out the detention of status offenders over a period of 3 years can invoke a 1-year hardship exception. That hardship exception is renewable every year for an indefinite period, and that is at the State's option.

The House-passed measure also includes a modified version of legislation by Senators Inhofe, Casey, and Vitter in this Chamber. That language would encourage the rehabilitation of youth who are at risk because of involvement in gangs or the criminal justice system.

The House bill shouldn't be controversial, which is why we are requesting unanimous consent to have the Senate pass it today. Again, I remind my colleagues that the other Chamber passed it by an overwhelming vote in September, after the Education Committee, under Chairman JOHN KLINE's leadership, reported the measure without a single dissenting vote.

I also thank our cosponsors, which include the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, as well as ranking member Senator FEINSTEIN, for their support of this legislation.

Unfortunately, when we sought to bring up the Senate version by unanimous consent back in February, a single Senator objected, preventing its passage. He has objected to the language that would require States to embrace one of the 42-year core principles.

Before this Congress comes to a close, we have a great opportunity to pass an important piece of legislation to help some of the most vulnerable children and youth in the United States. But it is not only these at-risk children who would benefit due to the reforms we have included in this bill; the legislation would benefit taxpayers as well.

I see Senator WHITEHOUSE on the floor. Before I ask unanimous consent, I wish to yield to him for the purpose of his speaking on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I thank Chairman GRASSLEY.

The chairman and I have been working on this bill since 2014. What we heard from juvenile justice practitioners around the country is that a lot of the policies which had been in place for dealing with juvenile offenders were stale and ineffective and that there were better ways to do business than were currently being supported by this grant. So we have worked for years to get this program, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, reauthorized.

I see Senator COTTON on the floor, and he can speak for himself, but I think the crux of today's concerns are that the JJDPA would phase out over time—over 3 years, in fact—the ability for States to take its money. You don't have to take the money, but if you take the money, you have to phase out locking up young people—kids—for status offenses, for offenses for which an adult could not be locked up. It is simply not good practice. That is one of the reasons the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges has supported this bill—they know it is bad practice. Indeed, the members of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges from the State of Arkansas support this measure.

The bill the chairman referred to that passed the House by such an astonishingly strong vote was voted for by every Member of the Arkansas delegation in the House of Representatives, and the senior Senator from the State of Arkansas supports this bill. We hope the junior Senator from Arkansas would be willing to take the legendary advice of Ben Franklin that perhaps we should doubt, each of us, a little bit of our own infallibility and give us a chance to let this bill go forward.

If Arkansas doesn't like this, there is a provision that the House put in that allows any State to declare itself outside of the provision under a self-declared hardship provision. That is an indefinite. That is not a 3-year phase-in; that is indefinite. So if the Arkansas courts really want to lock up juveniles for status offenses that no adult could be locked up for, all they have to do is declare under that provision. They may or may not want to do that. The fact that every other member of Arkansas' delegation in Congress appears to support this and that the family court members from the council appear to support it suggests that may not be the case.

In any event, we would like the ability to go forward. We are prepared to move this bill right now. I would be delighted to join the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in his motion for unanimous consent that the bill be adopted.

I would add for the record that these law enforcement leaders in Arkansas have expressed their support for the bill: Chief Alcon of the Mayflower Police Department; Chief Benton of the Ward Police Department; Chief Coffman of the Judsonia Police Department; Chief Harvey of the Lowell Police Department; Chief Kizer of the Bryant Police Department; Chief Lane of the Benton Police Department; Chief Reid of the Glenwood Police Department; Chief Sims of the Dardanelle Police Department; and Sheriff Sims of the Lafayette County Sheriff's Office.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I see my colleague from Arkansas on the floor. He is right so many times; I am sorry that we disagree on this issue. I don't believe the Senator will make me wrong on that point, but I do want to respect his right. He is such a good legislator.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 649, H.R. 5963. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I share mutual esteem with the Senator from Iowa. I hate to find myself on the opposite side of an issue with him. We had this conversation in February as well, almost 9 months ago.

There are many fine provisions in this legislation, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee outlined, including his legendary work on holding agencies and recipients of Federal funds accountable and working with the GAO to ferret out fraud and abuses.

My objection to this legislation is very specific. It is not, as the Senator from Rhode Island said, about the jailing of juveniles for so-called status offenses; that is, for something a juvenile would do—such as smoking cigarettes, running away from home, skipping school—that wouldn't be a crime

if you were 18 years old. So for all these young pages down here who are not supposed to be smoking cigarettes, the law currently says you cannot put them in jail for smoking cigarettes—and you shouldn't smoke cigarettes regardless. However, if a juvenile goes before a juvenile judge and the juvenile judge issues a valid court order and tells him ''Don't smoke any more cigarettes, don't skip school, and don't run away from home'' and that juvenile flaunts the authority of the judge, that judge needs some mechanism to enforce his orders. That is no longer a status offense; that is contempt of court. In my many conversations with Arkansans—be it judges, prosecutors, parents, or public defenders—they have said repeatedly that the judge needs that authority to get the attention of that juvenile delinquent.

I want this legislation to pass, as I said 9 months ago in a colloquy with the Senator from Rhode Island. I thought we had an agreement worked out about a provision on the inherent authority of judges. It didn't work out, but we worked together in good faith on it. On multiple occasions, I worked with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to resolve some of these issues.

Some activists say that we shouldn't do this to kids who are so young, so I proposed an age floor in the teenage years. Some say they might be corrupted or hardened by even more hardcore juvenile delinquents in a detention facility. I said let's impose a separation requirement. Some activists have said that they could be detained indefinitely. I said that is fine too; let's put a time limit on how long they can be detained. But repeatedly we have been told this legislation cannot be changed.

I would submit to the Senate that these are all small, reasonable changes that would allow this legislation to move forward quickly in the Senate here in these final couple weeks and again on the suspension calendar in the House of Representatives. But when Arkansans have specifically passed justice reform legislation in recent years in our legislature and they retained this authority of juvenile judges not to detain delinquents for their status offenses but because they disobeyed a valid court order, I don't think we in Washington should dictate a single one-size-fits-all solution for every State in the Union.

This legislation or legislation like it has come before the Senate multiple times in recent years, and every time it is hung up on this specific issue. I want to protect Arkansas' interests. I want to ensure that judges can enforce their own orders. I want to do what is best for the people of my State and our criminal justice system. I also want to pass this legislation. So I would offer to both proponents of this legislation that we continue to try to address some of these proposals I have made, but until then, I am going to have to, regrettably, object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I am disappointed that the Senator from Arkansas continues to impose the only remaining roadblock to passage of this critical piece of legislation.

Back in February, Senator COTTON indicated a willingness to work with Senator WHITEHOUSE and me to resolve our sole point of disagreement. Senator CORNYN tried to resolve our differences as well. As you can see, we are still at an impasse.

Our disagreement stems from a 42-year-old provision of the federal juvenile justice law that encourages States to phase out the detention of children who commit infractions, such as running away from home, skipping school, disobeying parents, or underage tobacco use. This statutory provision—which has been on the books since 1974—extends a ''carrot'' in the form of Federal grant funds, to any State that commits to deinstitutionalizing juveniles who commit extremely minor infractions, also known as ''status offenses.''

The reason for this core protection is simple: Locking up children for conduct, like running away or underage tobacco use, which could never, ever result in an adult's being jailed, defies logic and common sense.

For example, when you lock up a child for truancy, you ensure that the child will miss even more school and fall even further behind in schoolwork. At the same time you have done little, if anything, to resolve the underlying issue that led to the truancy. Similarly, very little is accomplished by locking up a repeat runaway who is being abused at home.

I urge my colleague to consider what happens when a judge sends an especially young child, who has committed the most minor infraction, known as a ''status offense,'' in juvenile detention with hardened or violent offenders. That young child, who has committed no crime whatsoever, is particularly vulnerable to abuse by older juveniles in detention.

Consider, too, that some of these children come from broken homes or have mental health issues. They are among the most vulnerable members of our communities and need our help. They don't need to be dumped in a detention facility where they will be exposed to violent criminals who have committed much more serious crimes than skipping school.

In the decades since 1974, Congress made good on its pledge to appropriate resources for every State that committed to fulfill the core requirements under the federal juvenile justice statute. About half of the States, recognizing that the detention of status offenders is mostly ineffective and tremendously costly, have made good on their commitment under this grant program. These States have phased out the practice of locking up status offenders entirely.

In another couple dozen States, judges invoke the ''valid court order'' exception sparingly. The exception is just that, an exception to be invoked only rarely. Status offenders end up in detention only occasionally in these states.

But in a tiny handful of States, some judges send status offenders to detention much more regularly. It has been reported that some of the children in detention for status offenses in one state are as young as 8 or 9. Juvenile advocates have charged that some judges are sending status offenders to detention as a general practice, which has led to calls for reform.

The Arkansas legislature has chosen to retain the option of jailing children for status offenses as a last resort option. This bill does not change that. This bill is not a mandate that would override the State's law. It merely lays out conditions for receiving Federal grant money. Arkansas is still free to not comply with the conditions set forth in this legislation.

I want to remind my colleague that over 100 nonprofit groups, numerous judges, and about 1000 law enforcement officers support this legislation. They agree that detaining child status offenders is not good public policy, based on significant research that points to the same conclusion.

I would also remind my colleagues that judges have multiple other options to hold these juveniles accountable. The other options include, for example, suspending the juvenile's driver's license, imposing fines, or ordering the juvenile into counseling, with or without parents. Counseling and other community-based alternatives not only cost much less, but are more effective than locking up children alongside violent criminals, research suggests.

This one issue is holding up a bill that is vital to help the children in our country.

Once again, I would like to point out that this legislation does not affect State law in Arkansas. We are merely imposing conditions to receiving Federal grant money. If this bill passes, which I hope will happen today, Arkansas is free to continue to invoke ''the valid court exception.'' So I ask that the Senator lift his hold on this critical piece of legislation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

STOP DANGEROUS SANCTUARY CITIES ACT

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I have spoken before on the floor about the tremendous dangers that arise from cities across America that choose to be sanctuary cities. Recent events compel me to come back to the floor today.

Just this week, Federal law enforcement officers finally found Winston Enrique Perez Pilarte. Pilarte was an illegal immigrant from the Dominican